

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 19, 2007, having a shortened statutory period set to expire October 19, 2007, extended to November 19, 2007. Claims 1, 3-4, 15, 18-19, 30, 41, 43-45 and 64 have been amended, Claims 78 and 79 have been withdrawn from consideration and Claims 2, 5, 16, 34, 42, 53-55 and 67 have been canceled. No new matter has been entered by these amendments.

Claim Rejections

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7, 11, 13, 20-22 and 27-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Mooney* (WO 99/44161). Further, Claims 4-5, 8-9, 23-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mooney* in view of *Wilson* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0054101A1). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mooney* in view of *de Jong et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,085,840). Claims 10, 12, 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mooney* in view of *Baber et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054774A1). Those rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the claims is requested.

With respect to independent Claim 1, therein is recited, *inter alia*:

generating one or more access codes, wherein one or more access codes is associated with one or more attributes;

receiving an access code of the one or more access codes from a computing device coupled to a first access point of the one or more access points;

determining a current geographic location of the computing device, wherein at least one attribute of the one or more attributes is associated with a geographic location;

determining if the access code is valid, wherein said determining if the access code is valid includes using the current geographic location of the computing device and the at least one attribute associated with a geographic location, wherein if the geographic location of the computing device is within an area of the geographic location of validity, then the access code is valid; and

if the access code is valid, providing access to the second network for the computing device, wherein said providing is based on at least one attribute of the one or more attributes, and wherein said access to the second network includes access to one or more services of the second network.

It is argued on page 5 of the present Office Action that *Wilson* discloses a network system that determines the current geographic location of a computing device because their server network is capable of generating access codes for each room of a hotel on a daily basis (paragraph 0177). Applicant respectfully points out that the capability of generating access codes corresponding to numeric room numbers is in no way related to making a determination of the current geographic location of a portable computing device. The fact that an access code is issued to a hotel guest has little to do with the geographic location of a portable computing device that may or may not belong to the hotel guest. In fact, in issuing access codes on a daily basis, there is nothing in *Mooney* or *Wilson* to show or suggest that the portable computing device ever had a geographic location within the hotel room, not to mention that *Wilson* provides means for determining that the hotel room is the “current geographic location of the portable computing device” as is recited in exemplary Claim 1 in the present application. *Wilson* does teach two alternatives to identifying a client as valid for access to the network. As explained in paragraph 0177, *Wilson* teaches two methods of registration, “access codes and port identification.” Port identification automatically determines the client’s room by querying the network switch infrastructure to determine the specifics switch port from which the client is connected. Switch ports are mapped to each specific room. Alternatively, “access codes can be used in the event the client is not connected from a guest room, such as when working from a public area in the hotel, or if the switch port cannot be determined” (see paragraph 0177). Therefore, *Wilson* teaches away from the present invention by suggesting access codes are an alternative method of verification when current geographic location of the portable computing device cannot be determined. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that *Wilson* cannot show or suggest the dual method of access verification by determining that an access code is being provided from a portable computing device that is within “geographic”.....wherein if the current geographic location of the computing device is within an area of the geographic location validity, then the access code is valid.”

Because *Wilson* in no way shows or suggests any method or system for determining the current geographic location of the portable computing device, it is impossible for *Wilson* to have shown or suggested verifying the validity of an access code based on confirming the validity of the current geographic location of the portable computing device.

With respect to independent Claim 15, *Barber* in no way shows or suggests the present invention as claimed therein. Exemplary Claim 15 in the present application recites, *inter alia*:

generating one or more access codes;
receiving an access code of the one or more access codes from a computing device coupled to a first access point of the one or more access points;
determining if the access code is valid;
if the access code is valid, providing access to the second network for the computing device, wherein said access to the second network includes access to one or more services of the second network;
wherein the first access point and the computing device communicate using wireless Ethernet (IEEE 802.11);
wherein the first access point is operable to concurrently utilize a plurality of IEEE 802.11 service set identifications (SSIDs);
wherein the access code is associated with a first IEEE 802.11 service set identification (SSID);
wherein the computing device uses an IEEE 802.11 service set identification (SSID) of the computing device; and
wherein said determining includes determining if the first IEEE 802.11 service set identification (SSID) matches the IEEE 802.11 service set identification (SSID) of the computing device, wherein if the first IEEE 802.11 service set identification (SSID) does not match the IEEE 802.11 service set identification (SSID) of the computing device, then the access code is not valid.

It is suggested on page 10 of the present Office Action that *Barber* teaches use of 802.11 standards and SSID's for accessing networks and determining whether a particular frame of data to be directed to a particular device, citing paragraphs 46 and 47. However, this is not what *Barber* is teaching in the cited paragraphs. Instead, *Barber* is teaching that “MAC addresses to create and update routing tables and network data structures and to determine whether a particular frame is directed at that device or where to direct a particular frame” is taught. The “MAC address” is the “link layer address.” As *Barber* teaches in paragraph 46, “each device that operates on an 802.11 network or other 802 network that is stored within a MAC address assigned by its manufacturer in a manner that insures that the stored MAC address is unique over all manufactured devices.” (*emphasis added*) In other words, the Medium-Access Control (MAC) layer address is unique to each device on the network. Therefore, having a unique

address, a particular frame can be directed to that device based on the MAC address of the device. In sharp contrast, SSIDs in no way identify devices at the MAC layer.

In paragraph 46, *Barber* is explaining that an access point on the 802.11 network may identify its SSID by use of its own MAC address (see paragraph 62 and 109). In order for multiple portable computing devices (“clients”) to associate with a particular access point, the clients must transmit the associated SSID for that wireless network (see paragraph 109). In other words, that access point’s BSSID is used by all portable computing devices to associate with the network at that access point. There is nothing within *Mooney* or *Barber* that suggests utilizing both the SSID in combination with the portable computing device’s transmitted access code to make a determination if the portable computing device should be granted access to the network. (That the transmitted SSID matches such that “wherein the access code is associated with the first IEEE 802.11 system identification” as is recited in independent Claim 15.) Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that *Mooney* in view of *Barber* neither shows nor suggests the present invention as claimed in exemplary Claim 15 in the present application and that the rejection under §103 should be withdrawn.

Having now responded to each rejection set forth in the present Office Action, Applicants believe all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request such allowance. Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Craig J. Yudell/

Craig J. Yudell
Reg. No.39,083
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS